DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 178 CS 507 179

AUTHOR Kelley, Douglas L.; Ninan, Molsey
TITLE Communication Skills Affecting Listening Satisfaction.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Sacramento, CA, February 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attention; Communication Problems; Communication Research; Interpersonal Communication; *Listening; *Listening Comprehension; Questionnaires; Satisfaction; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Satisfaction; Listening Research

ABSTRACT

A study examined skills related to an individual's satisfaction with a partner's listening ability. Forty-nine undergraduates in a listening skills class were asked to increase the use of effective listening behaviors with three to five individuals with whom they had a relationship--this resulted in 194 participants in the study. Two questionnaires were constructed for the participants. Results identified three skills which demonstrated significant positive correlations with sources' listening satisfaction: understanding, nonverbal attentiveness, and verbal responsiveness. A fourth skill, distraction, revealed a significant negative relationship with satisfaction. Findings suggested that perceived listener understanding accounted for the most variance in the source's satisfaction with the listener, while nonverbal attentiveness and distraction played important roles in predicting source listening satisfaction and the source's perception of listener understanding. Verbal responses appeared to have less impact on the listening process than did nonverbal attentiveness cues and distractions. (Five tables are included; 33 references are attached.) (Author/SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED320178

Communication Skills Affecting Listening Satisfaction

Douglas L. Kelley

Molsey Ninan

Seattle Pacific University

Running Head: LISTENING SKILLS AND SATISFACTION

Address correspondence to Douglas L. Kelley, Department of Communication, School of Humanities, Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, WA 98119. 206-281-2036

CS507179

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DOUGLAS L. KELLEY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study examines skills that are related to individual's satisfaction with their partner's listening ability. Three skills demonstrate significant positive correlations with source's listening satisfaction: understanding, nonverbal attentiveness, verbal responsiveness. A fourth skill, distraction reveals a significant negative relationship with satisfaction. Perceived listener understanding accounts for the most variance in source's satisfaction with the listener. Nonverbal attentiveness and distraction play important roles in predicting source listening satisfaction and source's perception of listener understanding. Verbal responses appear to have less impact on the listening process than do nonverbal attentiveness cues and distraction.

Rationale

Effective listening is considered by many communication theorists (Larson, Backlund, Redmond, Barbour, 1978; Nichols & Stevens, 1957) to be an important communication skill. Researchers have often focused on measuring memory retention as a method of evaluating individuals' listening abilities (Bostrom, Ray & Coyle, 1988; Larson, Backlund, Redmond, Barbour, 1978; STEP, 1957). While the ability to retain information, process it, and recall it is certainly an important part of the listening process (Wolvin & Coakley, 1988), another important aspect lies in the assumption that good listening produces better relationships (Nichols & Stevens, 1957). Unfortunately, much communication research regarding listening fails to examine listening's relational or interactional impact.

While using recall is a legitimate method of testing one's listening ability, it has only a moderate connection with interactional and relational consequences. For instance, an individual may be able to recall information, but not know how to communicate this to the sender. As such, the ability to listen and recall information accurately may not benefit the relationship if the source of the message does not perceive that listening and understanding has taken place. The purpose of this study is to examine what skills are related to individual's satisfaction with their partner's listening (referred to hereafter as source's listening satisfaction). In addition, this study examines whether changes in the receiver's listening

behaviors actually affect the source's listening satisfaction.

Listening Skills

A review of the literature reveals three skills important to interpersonal listening. The first two skills can be classified as behavioral components of listening ability: nonverbal attentiveness, verbal responsiveness. The third skill, empathy/understanding, represents a judgement that the speaker makes about the listener.

Listening Behaviors

Nonverbal attentiveness. A variety of nonverbal behaviors have been identified as attentiveness cues. In their review of research on the nature of arousal, Burgoon, Kelley, Newton, Keeley-Dyreson (in press) identify attentiveness as signalled by forward lean, relaxed posture, direct and high amounts of eye contact, facial attentiveness, and an interested body attitude (p. 19). Various studies have shown these behaviors to impact the counselor-client relationship.

Research examining the relationship between counselor attentiveness and client perceptions clearly indicates the importance of the counselor's nonverbal behavior in predicting the client's evaluative judgments of the counselor (Patterson, 1983). Waxer (1979) describes nonverbal attentiveness as affecting the counselor's ability to establish initial rapport with the client, and as influencing the progress of the therapy. Krumboltz, Varenhorst, and Thoresen (1967) had high-school students watch videotapes of attentive and inattentive

counselors. Attentiveness was operationalized through smiling, putting down other tasks when the subject enters, direct body orientation, nodding, facial expression and voice tone. They found attentive counselors to receive fewer negative comments from subjects than inattentive counselors. Dong, Zingle, Patterson, Ivey, and Hasse (1976) also found therapists rated more positively by patients when the therapists displayed high eye contact, forward lean, and concerned facial expressions. Additional studies have continued to support the relationship between favorable client perceptions of the counselor and expression of nonverbal responsiveness and attentiveness (gaze, forward body lean, gestures, head nodding, facial expressiveness) by the counselor (Claiborn, 1979; Kelly, 1972; Siegel, 1980; Siegel & Sell, 1978).

In sum, nonverbal attentiveness cues have been shown to affect progress in the counselor-client relationship. Nonverbally attentive counselors are rated by their clients as more attractive and empathetic than inattentive counselors.

Verbal responses. Verbal responses such as paraphrasing or asking clarifying questions can also be considered an important part of the listening process. These responses allow the listener to let the speaker know that they are listening and properly assigning meaning to the source's messages (Lange, 1984). Verbal responses also attempt to communicate warmth, caring, and acceptance (Okun, 1976). Nichols and Stevens (1957) also describe restating what the other has said as a good

strategy when the other becomes wild or unreasonable. Rogers and Farson (1973) believe that understanding only comes when one can express his/her understanding satisfactorily to the other. Finally, more experienced counselors ask open questions and reflect feelings, a type of paraphrasing (Ivey, 1980).

Given the potential impact of nonverbal attentiveness and verbal responsiveness on relational development the following hypothesis is stated:

H1: Source perceptions of a receiver's listening behaviors, i.e., verbal response skills and nonverbal attentiveness cues, are positively correlated with the source's listening satisfaction.

Verbal Responses and Nonverbal Attentiveness Cues

It is clear that both listening behavior dimensions (verbal responses and nonverbal attentiveness) are important to source's listening satisfaction. However, a variety of research suggests nonverbal attentiveness to play a larger role than verbal responses in predicting satisfaction. Birdwhistell (1955) estimated that 60% to 65% of meaning during social interaction comes from nonverbal cues. More recent studies in channel reliance have supported this premise (Burgoon, Buller & Woodall, 1989).

In addition, counseling research has also supported this relationship. Haase and Tepper (1972) found nonverbal responses to account for twice the variance of verbal responses in judged empathy of the counselor. Patterson (1983) also suggests that a

counselor's use of positive verbal cues only influences a client after the nonverbal involvement of the counselor is sufficiently high. The following hypothesis is posited:

H2: Nonverbal attentiveness cues are better predictors of source listening satisfaction, than are verbal responses.

Empathy/Understanding

Empathy can not be identified as readily as the two behavioral listening dimensions (nonverbal attentiveness and verbal responsiveness) discussed previously. Empathy is a process involving entering the other's private world and sensing the meanings of their experience without prejudice (Rogers, 1975). This understanding of our experience by another is critical to our development as persons and our development of relationships (Nichols, 1980; Satir, Stachowiak, and Taschman, 1975; Tournier, 1957). Counseling research demonstrates empathy to predict the success or lack of success in therapy (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Rogers, 1975). There is also reason to believe that this relationship is reciprocal. That is, success in therapy leads to higher ratings of counselor empathy by clients. Empathy as exhibited by a counselor or teacher is also positively correlated with constructive learning and change (Rogers, 1975).

This ability to empathize can be equated with understanding and plays a critical role in the evaluation of functional communication (Larson, et al., 1978). Studies in marital communication support this position. Laing, Phillipson, and Lee

(1966) found feelings of being understood to be positively associated with marital satisfaction. Navran (1967) discovered happily married couples felt more understood by their spouses than unhappily married couples. In a study by Ting-Toomey (1983), high marital adjustment couples were characterized by sequential patterns of confirming and sequential questioning patterns. These behavioral sequences allow individuals to progress toward mutual understanding. Other research has also demonstrated this relationship between marital satisfaction and understanding (Fliegel, Neumann, & Parr, 1983; Tiggle, Peters, Kelley, & Vincent, 1982) and mutual validation (Hassan, 1974).

In summary, it is clear that source's perceptions that the receiver understands the source are positively related to source's listening satisfaction. The following hypothesis is posited:

H3: Source perceptions that the listener accurately understands the source are positively correlated with the source's listening satisfaction.

According to Haase and Tepper (1972) nonverbal behaviors have greater power, than do verbal responses, in determining the degree of empathy a message carries with it. In light of this and the previous discussion for hypothesis two, which argues for the supremacy of nonverbal behaviors in conveying social meaning, the following hypothesis is stated:

H4: Nonverbal attentiveness cues better predict ratings of listener understanding than do verbal

response cues.

Listening Skill Training

Several authors (Haase & Tepper, 1972; Larson, et al., 1978; Nichols, 1957) believe that listening skills can be improved through training. Given the significant impact listening has on individuals and relationships, changes in listening ability should precipitate changes in relationships and source listening satisfaction. Thus the following hypothesis:

H5: Improvement in the receiver's response skills, nonverbal attentiveness cues, and ability to understand, result in an increase in source listening satisfaction.

RQ1: Which listening skills (nonverbal attentiveness, verbal responses, and understanding) better predict source listening satisfaction?

METHOD

Procedure/Sample

The study was conducted using 49 undergraduate students at a small private university in the Northwest. Each of these student/confederates, (females=37; males=12), all members of a listening class, were asked to increase the use of effective listening behaviors with three to five individuals with whom they had a relationship. This resulted in one hundred ninety-four participants who responded in the study. Each student/confederate administered the Listening Satisfaction Scale and the Listening Skills Measure to their participants. The two

measures were administered approximately one week apart in order to control for testing effects, resulting in inflated correlations between the two measures (Kelley, 1988).

These instrumenis ask each participant to rate the student/confederate as to how well he/she (the student) typically listens in their relationship. Participants were strongly encouraged to answer the questions honestly. They were told that the questionnaires were the only way for the student/confederates to gain accurate feedback about their listenig skills. Based, then, on participant responses, each student confederate implemented more positive listening behaviors over the next five weeks with each of their participants. Participants were not told that the student/confederates were improving their listening. Student/confederates were also instructed to increase their use of nonverbal attentiveness cues, appropriate paraphrasing and use of clarifying questions. Student/confederates were required to use these skills at least three times a week, five minutes at a time, with each of their participants. Student/confederates were also required to keep a journal for chronicling changes in their ability to implement improved listening skills in each relationship. At the end of five weeks each participant was given the LSS and LSM for a second time. After completion of the measures students debriefed their participants.

Questionnaire

In order to test the hypotheses, two questionnaires were constructed: 1) the Listening Satisfaction Scale (LSS), and 2)

the Listening Skills Measure (LSM). The Listening Satisfaction Scale consists of six items and uses Likert-type scales to measure each participant's overall satisfaction with a confederate's listening. Coefficient alpha reliabilities for pre- and post-test scores are .93, and .94, respectively.

Based on the literature discussed previously, the Listening Skills Measure was created using twenty-three items that focus on a source's perception of a confederate's listening skills. The instrument consists of two components: 1) items that measure behavioral skills, such as nonverbal attentiveness and verbal responses (i.e., paraphrasing and asking clarifying questions), and 2), items that measure more cognitive skills, such as understanding, which reflect whether the source perceives the receiver to comprehend his/her message.

Factor analyses were performed on the pre-test responses. The best solution was achieved using varimax rotation resulting in four factors accounting for 60.2% of the variance. The resulting factor structure with factor loadings exceeding .30 appears in Table 1. The first factor consists of five items representing receiver distraction. These items reflect the receiver being distracted, interrupting the source, changing the topic, or being involved in other tasks while trying to listen. Coefficient alpha reliabilities for pre- and post-tests were both .79.

Factor two's four items reflect the source's perception that the receiver understands him/her. Items indicate how the

receiver is perceived in terms of following the source's train of thought, missing the point, or judging what the source has said. Coefficient alpha reliabilities were .78 on the pre-test and .79 on the post-test.

Factor three consisted of four items focusing on nonverbal responsiveness. Items rating the receiver's use of head-nods, eye contact, facial expressions, and body language (posture, body position, arms and legs), resulted in coefficient alphas of .75 and .76 on the pre- and post-test respectively.

The final factor consisted of three items measuring verbal responses. Two items reflect asking clarifying questions and paraphrasing. The third item concerns seldom asking questions related to the source's topic of discussion. Deletion of this third item raised reliability estimates from α=.62 to α=.70 on the pre-test, and from α=.47 to α=.63 on the post-test.

To summarize, factors one, three and four consist of the behavioral items of the scale, including nonverbal attentiveness, verbal responses, and distraction. These items primarily represent behaviors or actions that can be observed. Factor two represents the more cognitive element of understanding. The items that constitute this dimension require participants to make judgments, i.e., do they believe that the receiver actually understands them?

RESULTS

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one was supported, positing that a receiver's

behavioral skills, i.e., verbal and nonverbal responsiveness as perceived by a source, are positively correlated with the source's listening satisfaction. This proposed relationship was supported for each behavioral dimension. The Bonferroni correction was used to safeguard against Type I error, setting the significance criterion at $\alpha=.05/4=.0125$. Both pre- and post-test results indicate nonverbal and verbal responses to be positively related to satisfaction; distraction exhibited a negative relationship with satisfaction (see Table 2).

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis found support, stating that nonverbal attentiveness cues are better predictors of source's listening satisfaction, than verbal responses. Stepwise multiple regression was conducted regressing listening satisfaction on to each behavioral dimension. The pre-test equation produced two significant predictors, overall $R^2=.31$, $F(2,164)=37.03$, $p<.01$. Nonverbal responses entered first, $b=.35$, $t=4.71$, $p<.01$, followed by distraction, $b=-.26$, $t=-4.44$, $p<.01$. The post-test equation produced three significant predictors, overall $R^2=.38$, $F(3,151)=30.68$, $p<.01$. Again, nonverbal responses entered the equation first, $b=.43$, $t=4.96$, $p<.01$, followed by distraction, $b=-.16$, $t=-2.64$, $p<.01$. In addition, verbal responses entered the equation third, $b=.11$, $t=2.43$, $p<.05$ (t-values for this and subsequent analyses are reported from the final regression equation).

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three also received support positing a positive relationship between source-perceived listener understanding and source listening satisfaction. Both pre- and post-test responses for understanding were positively correlated with source listening satisfaction. The more the source perceived the listener to understand his/her message, the more satisfied the source was with the receiver's listening (see Table 2).

Hypothesis Four

Stepwise multiple regression was used to examine this hypothesis, which states that nonverbal attentiveness best predicts the source's feelings of being understood. Understanding was regressed onto the three behavioral dimensions. The pre-test equation produced two significant predictors, overall R^2=.32, $F(2,165)$=38.03, $p<.01$. Nonverbal responses entered the equation first, b=.42, t=5.20, $p<.01$, followed by distraction, b=-.25, t=-4.02, $p<.01$. The post-test equation also produced significant predictors, overall R^2=.53, $F(2,168)$=93.02, $p<.01$. Again, nonverbal responses entered the equation first, b=.55, t=8.29, $p<.01$, followed by distraction, b=-.27, t=-5.38, $p<.01$.

In order to better understand the relationship between understanding, the listening behavior dimensions, and source listening satisfaction a stepwise multiple regression was performed. Source listening satisfaction was regressed on the four listening skill dimensions. The pre-test equation was significant, overall R^2=.46, $F(3, 163)$=45.74, $p<.01$, producing

three predictor variables. Understanding entered the equation first, b=.43, t=6.62, p<.01, distraction entered second, b=-.15, t=-2.79, p<.01, and nonverbal responses entered last, b=.17, t=2.43, p<.05. The post test equation was also significant, overall R^2=.57, F(2,152)=100.61, p<.01. Two significant predictors were produced, understanding again entered first, b=.68, t=12.42, p<.01, followed by verbal responses, b=.10, t=2.64, p<.01. Although the post-hoc nature of this analysis requires caution in interpretation, the primary role of understanding in predicting listening satisfaction appears evident.

Hypothesis 5

This hypothesis predicts that improvement in receiver's listening skills results in an increase in source listening satisfaction. Critical to the testing of this hypothesis is the assurance that confederates actually improved their listening ability. T-tests were performed on the four listening skill dimensions, contrasting pre- and post-test scores. All of the dimensions revealed a significant change in the predicted direction: increased understanding, t(162)=3.09, p<.01; increased nonverbal responses, t(161)=4.61, p<.01; increased verbal responses, t(156)=3.29, p<.01; and decreased distraction, t(156)=-1.73, p<.05 (for means and standard deviations see Table 3).

Change scores for listening satisfaction and each of the listening skill dimensions were computed by subtracting pre-test

from post-test scores. These scores revealed significant positive correlations with the source's change in listening satisfaction for three of the four listening skill dimensions: understanding, distraction, and nonverbal responses (see Table 4). It is interesting to note that while inspection of the means reveals verbal responses to show the most change from pre- to post-test, there is virtually no correlation between it and change scores for listening satisfaction, $r=-.05$ (see Table 4).

The research question, examined the relationship between listening skill dimensions when predicting source's listening satisfaction. Listening satisfaction change scores were regressed on change scores for each of the listening skill dimensions using stepwise multiple regression. The overall equation was significant, $R^2=.16$, $f(1,135)=26.38$, $p<.01$, producing understanding as the only significant predictor, $b=.45$, $t=5.14$, $p<.01$ (for means and standard deviations, see Table 5).

DISCUSSION

It is clear that an individual's listening satisfaction is dependent upon his/her perception of the receiver's listening skills. All four listening skill dimensions, understanding, nonverbal responsiveness, distraction, and verbal responsiveness, demonstrate significant correlations with the source's listening satisfaction. Distraction reveales a negative correlation, while the other three dimensions are postively associated with satisfaction. However, of the behavioral responses, nonverbal attentiveness and a lack of distraction appear to be tne key

predictors of the source's satisfaction.

In addition, source perceptions of whether he or she is being understood by the listener is strongly correlated with source's satisfaction. It also appears that the source's perception of a receiver being nonverbally responsive and not distracted are important to his/her evaluation of the receiver as understanding or following his/her thoughts. It is possible that the relationship between nonverbal attentiveness and distraction, and source's listening satisfaction is largely mediated by understanding, i. e., if a receiver exhibits appropriate head-nods, leans slightly forward, has good eye gaze and is not easily distracted, the source is likely to perceive the receiver as seeking to understand him/her and as such be satisfied with the listener's performance.

It should also be noted that nonverbal responses and distraction only accounted for 32% of the variance in understanding in the pre-test responses, but increased to 53% for the post-test. The increase in effective listening behaviors by the student confederates may have heightened more awareness of the listening process than usual in the source, resulting in higher correlations between nonverbal attentiveness, verbal responsiveness, and understanding than one would normally find. This would account for why two stepwise regression analyses using all four listening skill dimensions, one using means for the listening skills dimensions on post-test data and the other using change scores from pre- to post-test, failed to produce nonverbal

responses or distraction as significant predictors. Although these post-hoc analyses must be regarded cautiously, they are consistent with the previous analyses that found source's feelings of being understood to be closely associated with listening satisfaction.

The strong relationship between understanding and source's listening satisfaction may be due in part to the fact that participants in this study are in on-going relationships with the student confederates. It is possible that strangers may rely more heavily on nonverbal attentiveness cues, distraction of the listener, and/or verbal responses than do individuals who have a history together. For example, two individuals may be confident that they understand each other, even though they do not exhibit "good listening behaviors", because their past history of meeting one another's needs demonstrates that sufficient understanding of the other is taking place.

Hypothesis five was largely supported. Change scores for understanding, nonverbal responses, and distraction all demonstrated significant positive correlations with changes in source's listening satisfaction. Interestingly, while verbal responses reveal significant correlations to listening satisfaction for both the pre- and post-test data, change scores do not reveal a significant relationship to satisfaction. Evidently, while verbal responses are associated with listener satisfaction, increased verbal responses, when coupled with increases in other listening behaviors, does not increase

satisfaction.

Pre-test analyses revealed that verbal responses, such as paraphrasing and asking clarifying questions, failed to account for additional variance in source's listener satisfaction or understanding, beyond nonverbal responsiveness and distraction. However, post-test stepwise multiple regression analyses reveal verbal responses to be one of the three behavioral predictors of satisfaction (verbal responses entered third in the equation). In addition, when understanding was included in the stepwise analysis, understanding and verbal responses were the only two predictors for post-test data. This change from pre- to post-test analyses is likely due to the increased correlation between nonverbal responses, distraction, and understanding for post-test responses. Patterson (1983) suggests that counselor verbal cues may only have an effect on client's ratings of counselors when the counselor's nonverbal involvement is already sufficiently high. A similar effect may be operating here.

CONCLUSION

The largely exploratory nature of this study calls for continued research in this area. Future studies need to look at negative changes in listening patterns, as well as positive changes, and their impact on listening satisfaction. The rather high mean for listening satisfaction, six on a seven point scale, may have been due, in part, to the inability to assure confidentiality of the questionnaires for the participants. In addition, the Listening Skills Measure needs additional

validation. Especially important will be use of the questionnaire by observers to rate actual interactions, rather than only recalling one's listening history with an individual.

Examination of interpersonal listening skills and their relationship to satisfaction has highlighted the importance of the source feeling understood by the listener. In addition, it has emphasized the important roles that nonverbal responses and distractions play in creating perceptions of understanding and creating listener satisfaction. Verbal responses appear to have less impact on listening satisfaction than do other listening skills.

References

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (1962). Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 74.

Burgoon, J. K., Kelley, D. L., Newton, D. A., & Keeley-Dyreson, M. P. (in press). The nature of arousal and nonverbal indices. Human Communication Research.

Birdwhistell, R. (1955). Background to kinesics. ETC, 13, 10-18.

Bostrom, R. N., Ray, E. B., Coyle, K. (1989, May). Differential aspects of listening skill and the retention of medical messages: A study in validity. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Woodall, W. G. (1989). Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue. New York: Harper & Row.

Claiborn, C. D. (1979). Counselor verbal intervention, nonverbal behavior, and social power. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 378-383.

Dong, T. L., Zingle,, H. W., Patterson, J. G., Ivey, A. E., & Haase, R. T. (1976). Development and validation of a microcounseling skill discrimination scale. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 468-472.

Fliegel, S., Neumann, H., & Paar, F. (1983). Communication, satisfaction and understanding in couples: A model of causal relations and its empirical test. Partnerberatung, 1, 1-12.

Haase, R. F., & Tepper, D. T. Jr. (1972). Nonverbal components of empathic communication. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19, 417-424.

Hassan, S. (1974). Transactual and contextual invalidation between the parents of disturbed families: A comparative study. Family Process, 13, 53-76.

Ivey, A. E. (1980). Counseling and psychotherapy. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kelley, D. L. (1988). Understanding relational expectations and perceptions of relational satisfaction in marital relationships (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona).

Kelly, F. D. (1972). Communicational significance of therapist proxemic cues. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39, 345.

Krumboltz, J., Varenhorst, B., & Thoresen, C. (1967). Nonverbal factors in the effectiveness of models in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 14, 412-418.

Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. (1966). Interpersonal perception: A theory and a method of research. New York: Springer Pub. Co.

Lange, J. I. (1984). Seeking client resistance: Rhetorical strategy in communication consulting. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 12, 58-59.

Larson, C., Backlund, P., Redmond, M., & Barbour, A. (1978). Assessing functional communication. Urbana, Il: ERIC.

Navran, L. (1967). Communication and adjustment in marriage. Family Process, 6, 173-184.

Nichols, R. G., & Stevens, L. A. (1957). Are you listening? New York: McGraw-Hill.

Okun, B. F. (1976). Effective helping: Interviewing and counseling techniques. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.

Patterson, M. L. (1983). Nonverbal behavior: A functional perspective. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Rogers, C. R. (1975). Empathic: An unappreciated way of being. The Counseling Psychologist, 5, 2-10.

Rogers, C. R., & Farson, R. E. (1973). Active listening. In R. Huseman, C. M. Logue, and D. I. Freshley (Eds.), Readings in interpersonal and organizational communication (2nd ed.) pp. 548. Boston: Holbrooks Publishing.

Satir, V., Stachowiak, J., & Taschman, H. A. (1975). Helping families to change. New York: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Siegel, J. C. (1980). Effects of objective evidence of expertness, nonverbal behavior, and subject sex on client-perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 117-121.

Siegel, J. C., & Sell, J. M. Effects of objective evidence of expertness and nonverbal behavior on client-perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 188-192.

Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (1957). Listening. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Tiggle, R. B., Peters, M. D., Kelley, H. H., & Vincent, J. (1982). Correlational and discrepancy indices of understanding and their relation to marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 209-215.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1983). An analysis of verbal communication patterns in high and low marital adjustment groups. Human Communication Research, 9, 306-319.

Tournier, P. (1957). The meaning of persons. New York: Harper & Row.

Waxer, P. (1979). Therapist training in nonverbal behavior: Towards a curriculum. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), Nonverbal behavior: Applications and cultural implications (pp. 127-138). New York: Academic Press.

Wolvin, A. D., & Coakley, C. G. (1988). Listening (3rd ed.). Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown.

Wolvin, A. D., & Coakley, C. G. (1979). Listening instruction. Urbana, Il: ERIC.

Table 1*

Varimax Factor Structure, Means and Standard Deviations

Item Description	Mean	St.Dev	I	II	III	IV
DISTRACTION						
When discussing a concern I am often interrupted by ____for reasons that may or may not be important.	2.25	1.54	.78461			
When listening to me _____ is easily distracted.	2.43	1.52	.70908			
When we talk_____is often engaged in other tasks (i.e., watching t.v., eating, working, etc.).	2.97	1.85	.68587			
When talking with _____ he/she often changes the subject before I have completed what I have to say.	2.13	1.48	.65447			
I often have to repeat what I have said to ____.	5.42	1.36	.62825	-.41671		
UNDERSTANDING						
____ follows my train of thought accurately.	5.51	1.29		.82325		
When talking with ____I seldom feel that she/he has missed the point of what I am saying.	5.54	1.38		.73141		
I believe that I can discuss my feelings with ____ without being judged.	5.71	1.39		.71143		
When I am talking I feel that _____is listening to me.	6.11	1.12	-.30790	.59847		
NONVERBAL RESPONSES						
____often uses head nods to show he/she is interested in what I am saying.	5.47	1.36			.74148	
When I am talking,____uses facial expressions to tell me that he/she is listening.	5.66	1.18			.68605	
____maintains appropriate eye contact with me while I am talking.	6.02	.99			.66296	
____'s body language (i.e., posture, body position, arms and legs) tells me he/she is listening.	5.81	1.17	-.39458	.32666	.64305	

*Only factor loadings above .30 are reported

Table 1 (continued)

Varimax Factor Structure, Means and Standard Deviations

Item Description	Mean	St.Dev	I	II	III	IV
VERBAL RESPONSES						
____often asks questions to help clarify my thinking.	5.06	1.44				.81165
____often rephrases my statements to clarify what I have said.	3.95	1.76			.38926	.71230
____seldom asks questions related to what I am saying.	2.64	1.56	.31793			-.59618

Table 2

Correlation Matrix: Listening Satisfaction and Listening Skills Dimensions

Pre-test Responses

	Distract	Understand	Nonverbal	Verbal
Satisfaction				
Distraction				
Understanding	-.448*			
Nonverbal Responses	-.434*	.497*		
Verbal Responses	-.132	.234*	.401*	
Satisfaction	-.467*	.628*	.478*	
.184*				

Correlation Matrix: Listening Satisfaction and Listening Skills Dimensions

Post-test Responses

	Distract	Understand	Nonverbal	Verbal
Satisfaction				
Distraction				
Understanding	-.579*			
Nonverbal Responses	-.490*	.691*		
Verbal Responses	-.090	.311*	.426*	
Satisfaction	-.411*	.742*	.577*	
.365*				

*p<.0125

Table 3
Listening Satisfaction and Listening Skills Dimension
Means and Standard Deviations
Post-test Responses

Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation
Satisfaction	5.98	.94
Distraction	2.44	1.16
Understanding	5.72	1.00
Nonverbal Response	5.73	.90
Verbal Response	4.51	1.41

Listening Satisfaction and Listening Skills Dimension
Means and Standard Deviations
Post-test Responses

Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation
Satisfaction	6.10	.93
Distraction	2.31	1.15
Understanding	5.91	.94
Nonverbal Response	5.98	.87
Verbal Response	4.77	1.44

Table 4
Correlation Matrix: Change Scores for Listening Satisfaction and Listening Skills Dimensions
Pre-test Responses

	Distract	Understand	Nonverbal	Verbal
Satisfaction				
Distraction				
Understanding	-.356*			
Nonverbal Responses	-.340*	.361*		
Verbal Responses	-.006	-.030	.082	
Satisfaction	-.227*	.404*	.184	-.047

Table 5
Listening Satisfaction and Listening Skills Dimension
Means and Standard Deviations for Change Scores
Post-test Responses

Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation
Satisfaction	.16	.91
Distraction	.12	.86
Understanding	.22	.82
Nonverbal Response	.25	.64
Verbal Response	.34	1.27